Case 2:04-cv-01310-KJD-CWH	Document 106	Filed 03/12/12	Page 1 of 2

1 2

\_\_

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

NEVADA RESORT ASSOCIATION – I.A.T.SE. LOCAL 720 RETIREMENT PLAN,

Cross-claimant,

v.

JUDY CARMONA,

Cross-defendant.

Case No. 2:04-CV-1310-KJD-CWH

## **ORDER**

Presently before the Court is the Status Report (#98) of Cross-claimant Nevada Resort

Association – I.A.T.S.E. Local 720 Retirement Plan ("the Plan"). The Court Clerk also docketed the status report as a Motion to Reconsider Order on Motion for Summary Judgment (#100). Cross
Defendant Judy Carmona ("Defendant") filed an opposition (#99) to the motion to reconsider and an objection (#101) to the status report. The Plan filed a reply (#103) to the opposition and objection.

Defendant also moved for attorney's fees (#102) which the Plan opposed (#104).

The Court initially dismissed (#65) Plaintiff's complaint as barred by *res judicata* and denied (#75) Cross-claimant's motion for summary judgment on its claims for declaratory relief and dismissed those claims. Those orders were appealed (#77/79). On September 17, 2008, the Ninth Circuit issued an opinion, <u>Carmona v. Carmona</u>, 544 F.3d 988 (9th Cir. 2008), *amended and* 

superseded on denial of rehearing en banc, 603 F.3d 1041 (9th Cir. 2010), affirming the Court's 1 2 3 4 5 6 creating a constructive trust." 7 Carmona, 603 F.3d at 1062-63. 8 9 10 11 create a constructive trust. 12 13 on Motion for Summary Judgment (#100) is **GRANTED**; 14 15 **DENIED**; 16 17 claimant Nevada Resort Association – I.A.T.S.E. Local 720 Retirement Plan and against Cross-18 defendant Judy Carmona. 19 DATED this 12<sup>th</sup> day of March 2012. 20 21 22 23 Kent J. Dawson 24 25 26

Order (#65) that Plaintiff's claims were barred under the Rooker-Feldman doctrine, but reversing the Court's Order (#75) which had dismissed Cross-claimant's claims. The Ninth Circuit held: "IATSE's similar argument is not barred, however. We agree with its contention that is not required to make payments of the surviving spouse benefits to Judy or to the constructive trust ordered by the Nevada family court. Under ERISA, Janis's interest in the surviving spouse benefits vested at Lupe's retirement and federal law preempted the state court orders directing the plans to change the beneficiaries and Accordingly, the Court grants IATSE's claims for relief and declares that it is not required to make payments of the surviving spouse benefits to Judy or the constructive trust. Federal law preempts any and all state court orders directing IATSE to change beneficiaries, make payments to or Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Cross-claimant's Motion to Reconsider Order IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Cross-defendant's Motion for Attorney's Fees (#102) is IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk of the Court enter JUDGMENT for Cross-

United States District Judge